

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
BEAUFORT DIVISION

Lawrence L. Crawford,

PLAINTIFF

v.

The South Carolina Department of  
Corrections; Bryan Stirling; Warden  
Williams; Warden Sheppard; Warden  
Montell; Major Clark; Chaplain Ansari;  
SC Attorney General; Officer Ravenell;  
NFN Britt; The United States and / or  
Congress; Governor Henry McMaster;  
Lt. Belton,

DEFENDANTS

Case No. 9:18-cv-01408-TLW

**Order**

Plaintiff Lawrence L. Crawford, proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil action making a host of allegations in a 103-page Amended Complaint. ECF No. 31. The matter now comes before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) filed by the magistrate judge to whom this case was assigned. ECF No. 41.

In the Report, the magistrate judge recommends that the Complaint be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. After the magistrate judge filed the Report, Plaintiff filed a host of lengthy, variously titled documents.<sup>1</sup> He also filed a notice of appeal, which the Fourth Circuit dismissed.

---

<sup>1</sup> See ECF Nos. 43 (39-page filing with 340 pages of attachments), 44 (4-page filing with 5 pages of attachments), 46 (12-page filing with 11 pages of exhibits), 53 (2-page filing with 18 pages of attachments), 54 (27-page filing with 3 pages of exhibits), 57 (17-page filing), 58 (7-page filing with 16 pages of attachments), 59 (9-page filing), 60 (4-page filing with 19 pages of attachments), 61 (5-page filing with 2 pages of

ECF Nos. 47, 56. This matter is now ripe for decision.

In reviewing the Report, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections . . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

*Wallace v. Hous. Auth. of City of Columbia*, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in *Wallace*, the Court has reviewed, *de novo*, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and the objections, for the reasons stated by the magistrate judge, the Report is **ACCEPTED**. Plaintiff's objections are **OVERRULED**.<sup>2</sup> His Complaint is hereby **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

---

attachments), 62 (8-page filing), 65 (17-page filing), 67 (26-page filing), 68 (12-page filing), 69 (2-page filing with 29 pages of attachments), 70 (2-page filing with 9 pages of attachments), 71 (2-page filing with 7 pages of attachments), 72 (9-page filing with 54 pages of attachments).

<sup>2</sup> In the Report, the magistrate judge described the allegations in the Amended Complaint as "so broad, disjointed and generally incomprehensible and filled with what could only be considered by a reasonable person as unconnected, conclusory, and unsupported comments, or 'gibberish,' that it is unclear what is to be made of them." ECF No. 41 at 4. That description applies equally to Plaintiff's many post-Report filings.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

*s/ Terry L. Wooten*

Terry L. Wooten

Senior United States District Judge

September 24, 2019  
Columbia, South Carolina